Case 3:08-cv-02134-MMQVIL2COVERTSHEETed 04/24/2008 Page 1 of 1 ♦ JS 44 (Rev. 11/04) The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.) I. (a) PLAINTIFFS **DEFENDANTS** GOCLEAR LLC, a California limited TARGET CORPORATION, a Minnesota liability company corporation (b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Francisco County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE OF LAND INVOLVED (C) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Attorneys (If Known) James L. Day, Esq. LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111-6538 415-391-0600 II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant) 📗 1 U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question PTF DEF PTF DEF Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party) Citizen of This State ___1 ___1 Incorporated or Principal Place X 4 4 2 U.S. Government 4 Diversity of Business In This State (Indicate Citizenship of Parties Defendant Incorporated and Principal Place Citizen of Another State 2 2 ___ 5 X 5 in Item III) of Business In Another State Citizen or Subject of a 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 56 Foreign Country IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only) CONTRACT FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY 110 Insurance 610 Agriculture 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 400 State Reapportionment 310 Airplane 120 Marine ___ 362 Personal Injury -620 Other Food & Drug 410 Antitrust 315 Airplane Product 130 Miller Act Med. Malpractice 423 Withdrawal 625 Drug Related 430 Banks and Banking Liability 140 Negotiable Instrument 365 Personal Injury -28 USC 157 450 Commerce Seizure of 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liability 150 Recovery of Overpayment 460 Deportation Property 21 USC 881 PROPERTY RIGHTS Slander 368 Asbestos Personal & Enforcement of Judgment 470 Racketeer Influenced and 630 Liquor Laws 330 Federal Employers Injury Product Liability 151 Medicare Act 820 Copyrights Corrupt Organizations Liability 640 R.R. & Truck 480 Consumer Credit 152 Recovery of Defaulted 830 Patent 340 Marine 650 Airline Reas. Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) PERSONAL PROPERTY 490 Cable/Sat TV 345 Marine Product 660 Occupational X 840 Trademark 153 Recovery of Overpayment 810 Selective Service 370 Other Fraud Liability Safety/Health of Veteran's Benefits SOCIAL SECURITY 850 Securities/Commodities/ 350 Motor Vehicle 371 Truth in Lending 690 Other 160 Stockholders' Suits Exchange 380 Other Personal 355 Motor Vehicle 861 HIA (1395ff) 190 Other Contract **LABOR** 875 Customer Challenge Property Damage Product Liability 862 Black Lung (923) 195 Contract Product Liability 12 USC 3410 360 Other Personal Injury 385 Property Damage 710 Fair Labor 863 DIWC/DIWW 890 Other Statutory Actions 196 Franchise Product Liability Standards Act 891 Agricultural Acts (405(a)) **REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS** PRISONER PETITIONS 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 892 Economic Stabilization 864 SSID Title XVI 441 Voting 510 Motion to Vacate 730 Labor/Mgmt. Act 210 Land Condemnation 442 Employment 865 RSI (405(g)) Sentence Reporting & 893 Environmental Matters Habeas Corpus: 443 Housing/ 220 Foreclosure **FEDERAL TAX SUITS** 894 Energy Allocation Act Disclosure Act Accommodations 530 General 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 895 Freedom of 444 Welfare 740 Railway Labor Act 370 Taxes (U.S. Plaintif 535 Death Penalty Information Act 240 Torts to Land or Defendant) 445 Amer, w/Disabilities 540 Mandamus & 790 Other Labor Litigation 900 Appeal of Fee Employment 245 Tort Product Liability Other 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. 871 IRS - Third Party Determination Under 446 Amer. w/Disabilities 26 USC 7609 550 Civil Rights 290 All Other Real Property Security Act Equal Access to Justice Other 555 Prison Condition 950 Constitutionality of 440 Other Civil Rights State Statutes **ORIGIN** (Place an "X" in One Box Only) X 1 Original 2 Removed from 3 Remanded from 4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from 6 Multidistrict 7 Appeal to District Proceeding State Court Appellate Court Reopened another district Litigation Judge from Magistrate (specify) Judgment CAUSE OF ACTION Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 15 U.S.C. sections 1114, 1125 Brief description of cause: trademark infringement VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: X Yes No VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

JUDGE

APPLYING IFP

DATE

April 24, 2008 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT#

AMOUNT

NDC-JS44

MAG. JUDGE

1 sub
2 mai
3 use
4 offe
5 PRI
6 Tar
7 trad
8 Goo
9 awa

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

subsidiary Target Brands, Inc. Nevertheless, in 2005, Target adopted the confusingly similar mark CLEARRX (which may be read as "Clear Rx" or "Clear Prescription" among others) and used it to brand retail pharmacy services and newly designed medication bottles and labels offered in Target stores across the country. Now that the CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION trademarks have been registered by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Target's continued use of the CLEARRX mark constitutes infringement of GoClear's prior trademark rights and unfair competition under both federal and state law. Through this action, GoClear seeks injunctive relief to end Target's improper use of the CLEARRX mark and an award of all monetary relief available as a result of Target's improper use through and until the date the injunction is imposed.

THE PARTIES

- 2. Plaintiff GoClear, is a California limited liability company, with its principal business address in San Francisco, California.
- 3. On information and belief, defendant Target is a Minnesota corporation with its principle executive offices in Minnesota.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the asserted federal trademark infringement claims under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) and 1338 (original and exclusive jurisdiction over trademark actions as well as unfair competition claims joined with a substantial and related claim under the trademark laws), and over the remaining asserted claims under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1338(b) and 1367(a) (state law claims arising out of the same operative facts as the federal claims).
- 5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Target because it conducts business in California, including in this judicial district, and because it committed the wrongs complained of herein in California, including in this judicial district, as well as elsewhere throughout the United States.
- 6. Venue in this district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), given that a substantial part of the events giving rise to this action occurred in this district. Among other

GoClear has developed and sells skin care products to the public in connection with the

trademarks CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION. These products address common

3

4

BACKGROUND FACTS

GoClear develops, markets, and sells skin care and beauty products.

5

7.

is board-certified in Emergency Medicine.

6 7

8 9

10 11

12

13

1415

16 17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

skin conditions, including acne and blemishes, fine lines and wrinkles, hyperpigmentation, and photo-aging. GoClear offers its products for sale through third-party retailers and through its internet website www.goclear.com.

8. GoClear was established by Alan R. Gottlieb, MD, MPH. Dr. Gottlieb has been a practicing physician for 30 years, was trained and board-certified in Family Practice, and

- 9. In 2004, Dr. Gottlieb decided to develop a new line of skin care products to address deficiencies he identified in then-available cosmetic and over-the-counter skin care products.
- 10. Dr. Gottlieb identified several marks that he intended to use in marketing his new line of products and filed several ITU trademark applications with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office based on such an intention. Among others, Dr. Gottlieb filed an ITU trademark applications for the mark CLEARX on November 15, 2004 (App. No. 76978714) and the mark THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION on December 29, 2004 (App. No. 76978713).
- 11. With the filing of these applications, Dr. Gottlieb made claim to constructive priority for the CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION marks as of November 15, 2004 and December 29, 2004, respectively. Such constructive priority arises as a matter of law when the ITU trademark applications mature into trademark registrations.
- 12. From 2005 through early 2007, Dr. Gottlieb developed the formulation for his skin care products and, in 2006, established GoClear to commercialize those products. He licensed the marks covered by the ITU trademark applications to GoClear that same year.
 - 13. GoClear introduced the first product in the skin care line under the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION trademarks in June 2007.

14. Dr. Gottlieb filed Statements of Use with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in September 2007 for both marks. The CLEARX trademark (Reg. No. 3,414,941) and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION trademark (Reg. No. 3,414,940) were both registered on April 22, 2008. Copies of the registration certificates are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B, respectively.

- 15. On April 23, 2008, Dr. Gottlieb assigned the CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION trademarks to GoClear. Thus, GoClear owns all rights to these two federally registered trademarks.
- 16. The federal registration of these trademarks constitutes prima facie evidence that they are valid and that the owner, GoClear, is entitled to exclusive use of them in commerce, throughout the United States, for pharmaceutical-grade skin care products. Moreover, priority in these trademarks is based on their ITU trademark application filing dates (i.e., November 15, 2004 for CLEARX and December 29, 2004 for THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION).
- 17. On information and belief, Target learned of Dr. Gottlieb's trademark application and his intent to use the CLEARX mark in commerce no later than December 2004. On information and belief, Target also learned of the application for THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION mark within several months of its filing.
- 18. Target knew, or reasonably should have known, that the ITU trademark applications filed by Dr. Gottlieb in late 2004 would establish constructive priority in those marks upon the registration of those marks. Target also knew, or reasonably should have known, that any use of a confusingly similar mark by Target would constitute trademark infringement following the registration of the CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTIONS marks.
- 19. Nevertheless, Target subsequently adopted and began using the CLEARRX mark in connection with its pharmacy services and products, specifically including new "ClearRx bottles" and "ClearRx labels." Indeed, Target filed an ITU trademark application in early 2005 for CLEARRX in International Classes 016, 021, and 035 for "Paper labels,"

"Bottles for pharmaceuticals," and "Retail pharmacy services," respectively. The U.S. Patent
and Trademark Office issued an initial rejection of Target's application based on Dr. Gottlieb's
earlier-filed applications. The examining trademark attorney determined that there "may be a
likelihood of confusion" under federal trademark law between Target's CLEARRX mark and
Dr. Gottlieb's CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION marks. The Target application was
subsequently suspended. It remains suspended.

- 20. In addition to the ITU application leading to the federally registered CLEARX trademark, Dr. Gottlieb filed another ITU application in early 2005 for the use of CLEARX in connection with retail store services related to pharmaceutical-grade skin care preparations, among other things. In response, Target, through its subsidiary, filed an opposition to that later-filed application arguing that the claimed CLEARX mark is likely to cause confusion with Target's CLEARRX mark. In other words, Target effectively conceded that CLEARRX and CLEARX are confusingly similar marks.
- 21. Indeed, the CLEARRX mark used by Target is confusingly similar to GoClear's federally registered CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION trademarks. Consumer confusion between Target's and GoClear's marks is likely because, among other things, the retail channels are the same or substantially overlap, the classes of purchasers are the same, and retail pharmacy services are closely related to retail pharmacy products. Target has stated publicly that its CLEARRX retail pharmacy services and products were designed specifically to avoid consumer confusion. Yet Target adopted a mark that is likely to lead to confusion, and it did so despite the earlier CLEARX and THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION trademark applications and the constructive priority that those marks would enjoy once registered.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Trademark Infringement Under 15 U.S.C. § 1114)

- 22. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 21 are incorporated herein by reference.
 - 23. Plaintiff GoClear is the sole and exclusive owner of the CLEARX

trademark (Reg.	No. 3,414,941) and	THE CLEAR	PRESCRIPTION	trademarl
(Reg. No. 3,414	,940).			

- 24. Target's continued use in commerce of the CLEARRX mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, distribution, and advertising of Target's goods and services is likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception among consumers.
- 25. As a result, Target's use constitutes trademark infringement in violation of Section 32 of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114. Based on its knowledge of the ITU applications at issue, among other things, Target's acts of infringement are willful and deliberate.
- 26. Target's continued infringing conduct will cause GoClear damages in an amount to be proven at trial. Additionally, Target's infringing conduct has caused, and will continue to cause, irreparable harm to GoClear for which there is no adequate and complete remedy at law. Accordingly, GoClear is entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction preventing Target from continuing its infringing activities.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Trademark Infringement and Unfair Competition Under 15 U.S.C § 1125(a))

- 27. The allegations of paragraphs 22 through 26 are incorporated herein by reference.
- 28. Target's continued use in commerce of the term CLEARRX is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection, or association of Target with GoClear, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of goods and services or commercial activities by Target.
- 29. As a result, Target's activities constitute willful and deliberate infringement of GoClear's trademarks in violation of Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).
- 30. Target's continued infringing conduct will cause GoClear damages in an amount to be proven at trial. Additionally, Target's infringing conduct has caused, and will continue to cause, irreparable harm to GoClear for which there is no adequate and complete remedy at law. Accordingly, GoClear is entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction

2

1

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

3

4

(Unfair Competition Under California Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq.)

5

reference.

32.

33.

31. The allegations of paragraphs 27 through 30 are incorporated herein by

By engaging in the conduct alleged herein, defendant Target has engaged,

Target's continued infringing conduct will cause GoClear damages in an

6 7

and is continuing to engage, in business practices that are unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent, in violation of California's Unfair Competition Law, Business & Professions Code §§ 17200, et

8 9

seq. Among other things, Target's use of the mark CLEARRX violates Sections 32 and 43(a) of

10

the Lanham Act and is likely to lead to confusion of California consumers.

preventing Target from continuing its improper activities.

11 12

amount to be proven at trial. Additionally, Target's infringing conduct has caused, and will

13

continue to cause, irreparable harm to GoClear for which there is no adequate and complete

14

remedy at law. Accordingly, GoClear is entitled to a preliminary and permanent injunction

15

16

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

17

WHEREFORE, plaintiff GoClear prays for judgment as follows against defendant

18

Target:

19

1. For a preliminary and permanent injunction restraining and enjoining

Target, its agents, employees, attorneys, servants, subsidiaries, successors, assigns,

representatives, and any persons or entities in active concert or participation with Target, from:

22

20

21

advertising, selling, or distributing any products in connection with the a.

23

CLEARRX mark; or

24

b. using in any manner in connection with the sale of products, services, or

25

any associated activities, the CLEARRX mark or any marks, words, or names, similar to the

26

CLEARX or THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION registered trademarks, that are likely to cause

27

confusion, mistake, or to deceive:

28

2. For a permanent injunction requiring seizure and destruction of all

1 infringing marketing and advertising materials, as well as requiring Target to publish notice to all 2 persons who may have been confused, misled, or deceived by its misconduct: 3 3. For a permanent injunction ordering Target, its agents, employees. 4 attorneys, servants, subsidiaries, successors, assigns, representatives, and any persons or entities 5 in active concert or participation with Target to withdraw all applications pending with the U.S. 6 Patent and Trademark Office for the mark CLEARRX and any other marks, similar to the 7 CLEARX or THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION registered trademarks, that are likely to cause 8 confusion, mistake, or to deceive: 9 4. For a permanent injunction ordering Target, its agents, employees, 10 attorneys, servants, subsidiaries, successors, assigns, representatives, and any persons or entities 11 in active concert or participation with Target from using any internet domain names registered to 12 them that include the nomenclature CLEARX, CLEARRX, or any words, marks, or names, 13 similar to the CLEARX or THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION registered trademarks, that are likely 14 to cause confusion, mistake, or to deceive; 15 5. For general, special, actual, and statutory damages in an amount to be determined at trial, including though not limited to any lost profits, the cost of corrective 16 17 advertising, and a reasonable royalty; 18 6. For treble damages; 19 7. For an accounting of revenues and profits Target derived from it 20 misconduct by which it was unjustly enriched; 21 8. For restitution and disgorgement of said profits; 22 9. For costs of suit including attorney fees incurred as a result of this action; 23 10. For prejudgment interest on any award; and 24 11. For such other relief as the Court deems just and proper. 25 Dated: April 24, 2008 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 26

Attorneys for Plaintiff

GOCLEAR LLC

27

LATHAM WATKINS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

EXHIBIT A

Int. Cl.: 5

Prior U.S. Cls.: 6, 18, 44, 46, 51, and 52

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Reg. No. 3,414,941 Registered Apr. 22, 2008

TRADEMARK PRINCIPAL REGISTER

CLEARX

GOTTLIEB, ALAN RUSS (UNITED STATES INDIVIDUAL)
45 SANDERS RANCH ROAD
MORAGA, CA 94556

FOR: PHARMACEUTICAL GRADE SKIN CARE PREPARATION, NAMELY, MEDICATED SKIN LOTION FOR TREATMENT OF ACNE, IN CLASS 5 (U.S. CLS. 6, 18, 44, 46, 51 AND 52).

FIRST USE 6-11-2007; IN COMMERCE 6-27-2007.

THE MARK CONSISTS OF STANDARD CHARACTERS WITHOUT CLAIM TO ANY PARTICULAR FONT, STYLE, SIZE, OR COLOR.

SN 76-978,714, FILED 11-15-2004.

YONG KIM, EXAMINING ATTORNEY

EXHIBIT B

Int. Cl.: 5

Prior U.S. Cls.: 6, 18, 44, 46, 51, and 52

United States Patent and Trademark Office Reg. No. 3,414,940
Registered Apr. 22, 2008

TRADEMARK PRINCIPAL REGISTER

THE CLEAR PRESCRIPTION

GOTTLIEB, ALAN RUSS (UNITED STATES IN-DIVIDUAL) 45 SANDERS RANCH ROAD

MORAGA, CA 94556

FOR: PHARMACEUTICAL GRADE SKIN CARE PREPARATION, NAMELY, MEDICATED SKIN LOTION FOR TREATMENT OF ACNE, IN CLASS 5 (U.S. CLS. 6, 18, 44, 46, 51 AND 52).

FIRST USE 6-11-2007; IN COMMERCE 6-27-2007.

THE MARK CONSISTS OF STANDARD CHARACTERS WITHOUT CLAIM TO ANY PARTICULAR FONT, STYLE, SIZE, OR COLOR.

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO USE "PRESCRIPTION" AS TO THE CLASS 5 GOODS, APART FROM THE MARK AS SHOWN.

SN 76-978,713, FILED 12-29-2004.

YONG KIM, EXAMINING ATTORNEY



Filed 04/24/2008

Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA



GOCLEAR LLC, a California limited liability company,

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL CASE

Plaintiff,

V.

CASE NUMBER:

JCS

TARGET CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation,

Defendant.

CV O

2134

TO: (Name and address of defendant)

TARGET CORPORATION, 1000 NICOLLET MALL TPN-0945, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403

Agent for Service of Process: C T CORPORATION SYSTEM 818 WEST SEVENTH ST LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to serve upon PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY (name and address)

James L. Day, Esq.
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111-6538

Telephone: 415-391-0600 Facsimile: 415-395-8095

an answer to the complaint which is herewith served upon you, within 20 days after service of this summons upon you, exclusive of the day of service. If you fail to do so, judgement by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You must also file your answer with the Clerk of this Court within a reasonable period of time after service.

APR 24 2008

DATE _____

Richard W. Wieking

Helen L. Almacen